

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ARROW PRODUCTIONS, LTD.,)
vs.)
V.C.X. LTD., *et al.*,)
Plaintiff,)
Defendants.)
Case No. 2:09-cv-00737-PMP-PAL
ORDER

The court conducted a telephonic status conference with counsel on July 25, 2011, at 4:30 p.m. Allen Lichtenstein participated on behalf of the Plaintiff, and Timothy Riley participated on behalf of the Defendants.

The court conducted a settlement conference on June 29, 2011. After spending several hours, counsel believed they had resolved their remaining issues to complete a settlement. The court gave the parties until July 13, 2011, to meet and confer to finalize their settlement agreement and prepare a proposed stipulated judgment to effectuate the terms of the agreement. A telephonic status conference was held July 13, 2011, when the parties had not yet filed the stipulation to dismiss. Counsel advised the court that they believed they had a settlement, but both sides still needed final approval from their clients, and the proposed stipulation for entry of judgment needed to be drafted. Counsel hoped to have the matter concluded sooner, but due to scheduling conflicts of counsel for Plaintiff, requested a July 25, 2011 status conference if the stipulation to dismiss was not on file. The court granted the request.

At today's status conference, counsel for Defendants advised the court that his client saw the signed form of agreement that Plaintiff signed over the weekend, and that something the parties had agreed to had been "pulled out." Mr. Riley and Mr. DeWitt have been discussing the matter, but the documents are not finalized.

The parties were ordered by the district judge to submit a Joint Pretrial Order and filed a Pretrial Order on May 31, 2011 (Dkt. #43). However, the Joint Pretrial Order did not comply in all respects with the form of Pretrial Order adopted by LR 16-4. Counsel did not submit a list of three agreed upon trial dates, or provide the trial court with an estimate of how long the trial would last. The Joint Pretrial Order submitted by the parties also did not contain Section XI for action taken by the court. However, a Proposed Order (Dkt. #44) was submitted June 14, 2011, for action to be taken by the court.

Counsel have twice assured the court that they were close to finalizing a settlement agreement and stipulated judgment. A July 25th status conference was requested out of an abundance of caution because counsel believed the matter should be finally resolved before then. The matter has not been resolved, and no resolution is imminent. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED counsel shall have until August 15, 2011, to either file the stipulated judgment with the court, or provide the court with three agreed upon dates for trial, and an estimate of how long the trial will last so that this matter can be set for trial and resolved.

Dated this 25th day of July, 2011.

Peggy A. Leen
Peggy A. Leen
United States Magistrate Judge